

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IJPSS_117876
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of basal and foliar nutrition on kabuli gram (Cicer kabulium L.) cultivars
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is of medium importance for the scientific community because the study design and the results were not clearly illustrated.</p> <p>2. The title is good.</p> <p>3. The abstract is concise enough, but modification is needed. The author can revise that based on the comments given directly in the reviewed manuscript.</p> <p>4. The subsections were not fully given because the conclusion is missing. Therefore, the author should write this part and make a clear summary.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is somewhat correct in scientific terms because a lot more information is needed. For example, the experimental plot design, statistical test and software were not mentioned, so it is hard to evaluate the results of the study.</p> <p>6. More references are needed, especially for the introduction because there are none.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language used is acceptable, but improvements are needed to make the manuscript scientifically correct.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript should be accepted for publication only when the author can address the comments properly; otherwise, it does not provide an insight to the reader.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hin Lyhour
Department, University & Country	Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia